

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the examination of the application. However, in view of the foregoing amendments and the remarks that follow, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections.

The independent claims of the present application have each been amended to limit the claims to glasses with different OH⁻ contents.

In addition, the dependent claims have been amended and a new claim 27 is added to further define the protection to which Applicants are entitled. Claim 27 has support in the description p. 3. I. 35 and p. 6. I. 27-33. The dependent claims are allowable at least for the reasons set forth below with respect to the independent claims from which they depend.

Claims 1-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0056546, hereinafter *Claus*. As pointed out by the Examiner, *Claus* sets forth in paragraphs 0028 and 0032 that the cladding material can be used with different doping material. In other words, in *Claus*, dopant ions are added to the material to modify the refractive index of the region in question.

In contrast to *Claus*, one of the objects of the present invention is to provide for lowering the cost of manufacturing optical fibers with relatively low optical loss per unit length. This objective is achieved by using materials of different purities, e.g., OH⁻ contents, for different parts of the optical fiber. The use of relatively high purity (and thus typically more expensive) material provides a relatively lower optical loss. In at least one embodiment of the present invention, the relatively higher purity

material is made by removing unintentionally present impurities in the material that negatively influence optical loss of the material.

To clarify the distinction between the present invention and *Claus*, the three independent claims have been amended as set forth above.

There is no teaching or suggestion in *Claus* that by deliberately choosing starting materials having different respective purities defined by OH⁻ content, an optical fiber is created where the purity of the cladding region is lower than the purity of the core region of the fiber.

In view of the fact that *Claus* does not teach the combination set forth in independent claims 1, 12, and 13, particularly as amended above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of those claims be withdrawn. Furthermore, the dependent claims are also patentable over the independent claims by virtue of the features recited therein, in addition to the features recited in the independent claims from which they depend.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections.

In the event that there are any questions concerning this response, or the application in general, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone the undersigned attorney so that prosecution of the application may be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: May 17, 2007

By: /WCRoland/
William C. Rowland
Registration No. 30888

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620